

REMARKS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the above-mentioned Official Action in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3-13, 16, 50, 51, and 56 are now pending in the application, with Claims 1 and 50 being independent. Claims 1, 9, 16, and 50 have been amended herein. Claims 15 and 15 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 1, 3-7, 9, 15, 55, and 56 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,226,886 (Lakes) in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,971,315 (Hansen), U.S. Patent No. 3,326,180 (Lofgren), and U.S. Patent No. 6,051,629 (Ichikawa et al.). Claims 8 and 10-13 were rejected under § 103(a) over Lakes, Hansen, Lofgren, and Ichikawa et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,213,751 (Terry). Claim 16 was rejected under § 103(a) over Lakes, Hansen, Lofgren, and Ichikawa et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,009,440 (Kent). Claims 1, 3-7, 9, 15, 55, and 56 were rejected under § 103(a) over Lakes in view of Hansen, Lofgren, and U.S. Patent No. 5,737,071 (Arndt). Claims 8 and 10-13 were rejected under § 103(a) over Lakes, Hansen, Lofgren, and Arndt and further in view of Terry. Claim 16 was rejected under § 103(a) over Lakes, Hansen, Lofgren, and Arndt and further in view of Kent. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

As discussed previously, Applicants submit that by using a highly viscous liquid, such as those recited in the claims, with a porous film having the claimed pore size,

it can be insured that the most effective amount of liquid can be transferred to the printed surface. That is, an adequate amount of liquid can be transferred to the printed surface by virtue of the combination of pore size and the viscosity of liquids. As described in Applicants' specification in the paragraph beginning at page 35, line 10, when the pore size of the porous film is too large, the amount of the exuded liquid becomes excessive, and if the pore size is too small, the amount of the exuded liquid is insufficient.

Lakes describes a self-metering liquid retentive pad. Lakes describes using a void former, such as a non-reactive salt of a size range between 2 and 450  $\mu\text{m}$ . Such is greater than the pore size of 0.1 to 1  $\mu\text{m}$ , as recited in independent Claims 1 and 50. Nor does Lakes disclose or suggest a lid adapted to cover a printed product from a side of the printed product opposite from a transfer surface, as is recited in independent Claim 1, or applying a depression force through a lid that covers the printed product from a side of the printed product opposite from the transfer surface, as is recited in independent Claim 50. The Office Action suggests that it would be obvious to use a lid in Lakes to prevent the liquid from drying out. Even, for the sake of argument, conceding such a point, the Office Action provides no suggestion of the lid covering the printed product from the side of the printed product opposite to the transfer device.

Thus, Lakes fails to disclose or suggest important features of the present invention recited in the independent claims.

Hansen is directed a marking structure for use in ink pads, for example, and describes using a material having a pore size between 0.5 and 100  $\mu\text{m}$ . However, Hansen

describes a very broad range and does not discuss the importance of a lower end of that range. Moreover, the range recited in Hansen (.5 to 100  $\mu\text{m}$ ) and the range recited in Lakes (2 to 450  $\mu\text{m}$ ) has an overlapping range (2 to 100  $\mu\text{m}$ ). To the extent that one of ordinary skill in the art may be motivated to combine the teachings of Lakes and Hansen, it is respectfully submitted that at most one would use the overlapping range of 2 to 100  $\mu\text{m}$  so as to achieve the intended results of both patents. Moreover, Hansen also does not disclose or suggest the features of the lid recited in independent Claims 1 and 50.

The remaining citations have been reviewed, but are not believed to be any more relevant than those discussed above.

Thus, Claims 1 and 50 are patentable over the citations of record.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections are respectfully requested.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the present invention is patentably defined by independent Claims 1 and 50. Dependent Claims 3-13, 16, 51, and 56 are also allowable, in their own right, for defining features of the present invention in addition to those recited in their respective independent claims. Individual consideration of the dependent claims is requested.

Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the above-noted Office Action, and an early Notice of Allowability are requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark A. Williamson/

---

Mark A. Williamson  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 33,628

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200  
MAW:ytr

FCBS\_WS 1918828v1